



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/236,057 01/22/99 HUGH

H

EXAMINER

TM02/0327

CH IEN-WEI (CHRIS) CHOU, ESQ.  
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP  
3373 HILLVIEW AVENUE, SUITE 200  
PALO ALTO CA 94304

SAY, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED:

03/27/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09 236057

Applicant(s)

Hugh et al

Examiner

Sax

Group Art Unit

2173

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) 57-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 57-66 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 5

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2173

### DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined.

#### *Election/Restriction*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-56, drawn to system for navigating and manipulating a thought matrix, classified in class 345, subclass 357.
  - II. Claims 57, 58, 60-66, drawn to system for identifying and transmitting documents between computers, classified in class 707, subclass 10.
  - III. Claim 59, drawn to a speech recognition system for identifying items, classified in class 709, subclass 200.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as navigating and associating thoughts in a matrix. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 2173

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II or Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: During a telephone conversation with Mr. Chris Chou on 3/22/01 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-56. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 57-66 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 2173

### *Double Patenting*

8. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101

9. Claims 1-5, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-6, 9 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6031537. This is a double patenting rejection.

The same elements are recited and claimed.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2173

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 6-8, 11-56 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6031537. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim activities related to navigating and manipulating thoughts in a matrix and the information they represent.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Steve Sax, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F from 9:30 - 6:00 ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim, can be reached at (703) 305-3821.

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'SW' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

STEVEN SAX  
PRIMARY EXAMINER